



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/594,249 | 09/25/2006 | Hajime Saito | 0033-1107PUS1 | 7406 |
| 2292 | 7590 | 03/10/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH | | | GREEN, TRACIE Y | |
| PO BOX 747 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | 2879 | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 03/10/2009 | ELECTRONIC | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/594,249 | SAITO ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | TRACIE Y. GREEN | 2879 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Sikha Roy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the examiner in using the Atagi reference does not provide for a solid illuminant blue-violent absorbent, thus all features of claim one have not been taught and thus is allowable. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly the applicant points to Juestal in view of Doxsee to the solid illuminant containing SM. Including the limitations of the red phosphor with either SM or EU which Juestal teaches and thus the secondary reference of Atagi was not used. Applicant argues that the material used is an oxide version of SM, examiner does not see anywhere in the claim language that excludes the sm containing material have samarium in oxide form. Applicant asserts that the Atagi reference does not use samarium in any of the examples; however the applicant on Page 6 states the following "a light-emitting device remarkably higher in efficiency and longer in life as compared with the prior art and excellent in color rendering can be provided. In light-emitting device 100 according to the present invention, illuminant 105 may contain a luminous material (at least one material selected from rare earth elements such as La, Ce, Pr, Nd, Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy, Ho, Er, Tin, Yb and Lu and transition elements such as Mn, Cr, V and Ti, for example) other than Sm" but does not present examples using all the material s presented here in the 22 pages of the disclosure. Likewise, Atagi presents such a case and shows how the Lathanide series could allow for the illumination characteristics desired from the lamp. Because Atagi does not present a specific example does not preclude this reference in combination with the other two from rendering the applicant's invention obvious. As such it is believed that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention could further modify the device of Juestal and arrive at the applicant's invention. Examiner believes all claims to be proper and thus they remain rejected as presented in final office action..